

# Interview Summary

Application No.

10729925

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Duc T. Doan

Art Unit

2188

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Duc T. Doan(3) SHRINATH MALUR (34,683)(2) Kern Ellis(4) HIROSHI KAWANODate of Interview: 10/25/05(5) MASAHITO KAWAGUCHIType: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 10Identification of prior art discussed: Hubs et al 6343324 USAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discuss proposal amended claim 10 in view of Hubs et al & Olaf, moved and presented arguments  
Proposed amendments overcome the rejections - Further search/consideration is needed for the proposed amendments

Kern Ellis

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Duc Doan  
Examiner's signature, if required